



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,719	09/22/2003	Frank J. Tortorella JR.	15050US01	9715
7590	09/27/2006		EXAMINER	
McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd. 34th Floor 500 W. Madison Street Chicago, IL 60661			CANFIELD, ROBERT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3635	

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/667,719	TORTORELLA, FRANK J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert J. Canfield	3635	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3635

1. This is a first Office action on the merits for application serial number 10/667,719 filed 09/22/03. Claims 1-11 are pending.

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: page references the window lock as reference numeral 115 after it has been previously designated as numeral 155. Numeral 155 appears to be the numeral used in the figures.

Appropriate correction is required.

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: hinge **160** (page 9 of spec). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-3 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,009,048 to Paul.

Paul teaches a plurality of glass blocks 101-112 (figure 3) bonded together using a transparent silicone based adhesive (column 2, lines 29+). Any one of the blocks may be considered the substantially transparent window of the claims.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-3 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,315,798 to Zarwell in view of U.S. Patent 5,009,048 to Paul.

Zarwell provides light permeable window 10 in conjunction with a plurality of glass blocks 12 (figure 1). The window is provided with a screen which inherently is a substantially transparent material.

Zarwell fails to provide that the mortar used is a substantially transparent adhesive.

Paul teaches at the time of the invention it was known to use transparent or clear silicone adhesives as the mortar in glass block wall construction.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one having ordinary skill in the art that the mortar used in Zarwell could have been transparent as taught by Paul. It would have been obvious to take advantage of the inherent property of increased light transmission and for aesthetic reasons of eliminating unsightly mortar lines.

8. Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,315,798 to Zarwell as modified above by U.S. Patent 5,009,048 to Paul further in view of U.S. Patent 5,941,596 to See.

Zarwell as modified by Paul provides each of the elements of the claims as noted above except that the window includes a frame composed of light-permeable material.

See teaches at the time of the invention it was known that windows could be provided with transparent framing members 14 to improve illumination, increase light transmission, and aesthetic appeal.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one having ordinary skill in the art that the frame 14 of Zarwell could have been made from a transparent plastic material to take advantage of the improve illumination, increase light transmission, and aesthetic appeal taught by See and further because Zarwell suggests that any suitable material may used. One of ordinary

skill in the art would have readily recognized that if increased light transmission was desired a transparent plastic would have been an obvious material choice as taught by See.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert J. Canfield whose telephone number is 571-272-6840. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Naoko Slack can be reached on 571-272-6848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Robert Canfield
Primary Examiner

